



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Book Reviews

ASSYRIAN CHRONOLOGY¹

The historian who attempts to settle problems in Assyrian history is unwise at any time and especially in and after a great war, when scholarship is interrupted and works of scholarship do not circulate freely. In the case of the reviewer's study on early Assyria, *AJSL*, XXXVI, 124 ff., retribution for such rashness has followed with unusual swiftness, for Weidner's discovery of a few chronological tables among the Ashur tablets, in part published in Germany as early as 1915,² and now completed in the study before us, has antiquated the whole. The actual results can be given in three or four pages, but they force a complete re-writing of almost every page in the earlier Assyrian history.

A certain Ititi is now added to the non-Semitic Ushpia and Kikia. The first family group is extended to include Puzur Ashir I, Shalim ahum, Ilu shuma (also called Shamshi lishuma), Erishum I, Ikunum, Sargon I, Puzur Ashir II, Ahi Ashir, Rim Sin, Erishum II. It was already known that Ilu shuma was contemporary with Sumu abu; from the chief tablet we learn that Erishum lived at the time of Sumu la ilu. It is probable that the Rim Sin of the list is the well-known Larsa king whose territory included Amurru.

After a "Babylonische Fremdherrschaft," whose length will be determined by one's views as to the date of the First Dynasty of Babylon, we have the group Shamshi Adad I, to whom all the early inscriptions are assigned in this latest study, Ishme Dagan I, . . . ashshat, and Rimush. A third group begins about 1825 with Adasi, from whom Esarhaddon counted his descent, and includes Bel bani, Shabai, Sharma Adad I, Gizil Sin, Zimzai, Lullai. One edition omits this group entirely, showing doubt of the legitimacy, and the names are unusual.

About 1750 Pan Ninua arrives, and after him Sharma Adad II, Erishum III, Shamshi Adad II, Ishme Dagan II, Shamshi Adad III, an unknown, the signs of whose name cannot be read, Puzur Ashir III, Enlil nasir I, Nur ilu, Ishme Dagan III, Ashir nirari I, covering the period to about 1550. Puzur Ashir IV has first relations with Babylonia. Enlil nasir II, Ashir rabi I, and Ashir nirari II are followed by Ashir bel nisheshu and Ashir rim nisheshu, no longer to be identified. We now reach the well-known rulers, where also the older form for the chief deity Ashir is changed to the

¹ *Die Könige von Assyrien*, "Neue chronologische Dokumente aus Assur." Ernst F. Weidner, Leipzig; Hinrichs, 1921. 66 pages, M. 10.

² *MVAG*, XX, 4; *MDOG*, LVIII.

better-known Ashur, Ashur nadin ahe, Eriba Adad, Ashur uballit, Enlil nirari, Arik den ilu, Adad nirari I, Shalmaneser I, Tukulti Ninurta I. The son who assassinated the last named was Ashur nadin apal, not Ashur nasir apal. Ashur nirari III ruled six years, which we may place 1213–1207, and Enlil kudur usur five, 1207–1202.

Weidner has very cleverly proved that six numbers on a broken edge apply to the six following rulers. Ninurta apal ekur I, whose ancestor Eriba Adad did not rule and should not be counted, reigned twenty-seven years (1202–1175), and Ashur dan I thirty-five (1175–1140). Ninurta tukulti Ashur is intercalated next in some tablets, but his reign can only be calculated at three years according to Weidner. Without doubt he is a usurper, and as clearly is the man mentioned in the two letters discussed *AJSL*, XXXVI, 142 ff. The author of the first must be Nebuchadnezzar I, whose reign is shown to have begun just before. The Enlil kudur usur on whom the former dating was based cannot as a result be the Assyrian king.

The line was restored by Mutakkil Nusku with ten years (1137–1127), Ashur resh ishi with twelve (1127–1115), and the great Tiglath Pileser I with thirteen (1115–1102). The Ninurta apal ekur II, who follows him for ten years (1102–1092), is a usurper. Ashur bel kala, son of Tiglath Pileser I, is given seventeen years (1092–1075), but his name appears twice with Enlil rabi between, and Weidner suggests that he was expelled by this man and that his already known visit to Babylon secured the aid which reinstated him. He is followed by Eriba-?, where we might conjecture the doubtful sign an error for Adad, assuming that he was a son of Ashur bel kala and that he was named from the ancestor of the dynasty's founder. Only then do we have Shamshi Adad IV, another son of Tiglath Pileser I. Ashur nasir apal I, with nineteen years, is assigned to 1049–1030, Shalmaneser II with twelve to 1030–1018, and Ashur nirari IV with six to 1018–1012. Ashur rabi has at least fourteen years, but we do not know the length of reign of Ashur resh ishi II. Tiglath Pileser II with thirty-three years is placed from 966–933. Ashur dan II is the last before we have our old and well-fixed chronology.

The numbers of well-known kings are changed in many cases. We have Adad nirari II, Tukulti Ninurta II, Ashur nasir apal II, Shalmaneser III, Shamshi Adad V, Adad nirari III, Shalmaneser IV, Ashur dan III, Adad nirari IV, Ashur nirari V, Tiglath Pileser III, Shalmaneser V, Sargon II. The most striking change here is that Tiglath Pileser is no longer the fourth but the third. With but slight exceptions, the list of Assyrian kings is now complete.

Weidner also gives a table of all the Babylonian kings. His earlier dates are based on that for the First Dynasty of Babylon, 2057–1758, which he secures with the aid of Neugebauer, from the same Venus observations which gave Kugler the generally accepted 2225–1926. Weidner's date is later by forty-nine years than the latest alternative date given by Kugler.

When astronomers disagree, simple historians must appeal to synchronisms. Weidner finds support for his date in the dating of Ilu shuma and Erishum by Shalmaneser I and Tukulti Ninurta I which gave for the latter 2039–2019. He also finds collaborative evidence in a variant reading for the date of the capture of Nana by the Elamites as given by Ashur bani apal. But this is an unimportant fragment, while the true reading seems that of the two better documents, while Weidner himself rejects other cases of simple calculation which indeed must be always viewed with some suspicion.

Judged by calculations alone, the data favor Kugler. The Berossus date of 2232 for the beginning of the so-called First Dynasty fits Kugler's 2225 too closely to be accidental. Nabu naid states that Hammurapi lived seven hundred years before Burna Buriash and seven hundred years before 1385, the date of the accession of Burna Buriash II according to Weidner, gives 2085, four years before the death of Hammurapi, according to Kugler. Further, Enlil nadin apal states that Gulkishar of the Second Dynasty lived 696 years before his fourth year, and Weidner frankly admits that he can do nothing with this statement. Adding 696 to 1120, not more than two or three years out of the way at most, we have 1816 as Enlil nadin apal's date for Gulkishar, while the one based on Kugler's astronomy would be 1860–1805. Weidner's own chief source is a witness against him. It gives in one column the list of Assyrian kings and in the next the Babylonian king who was contemporary. Just once we do have two Babylonian kings in one line, and they are Ea Gamil the last king of the Second Dynasty and Gandush, the first of the Third, and they are contemporary with Shamshi Adad II. Now Shamshi Adad II is placed by Weidner 1724–1714 and Gandash 1746–1731, the second one year later than I did, but Ea gamil he assigns to 1525–1517. The Assyrian scholars did strange things, but that they should place in one line kings who lived two centuries apart seems rather difficult to assume.

There is, however, another test which is not in the form of calculation. Ea gamil, the last king of the Second Dynasty, was defeated by Ulam Buriash, brother of Kashtiliash I, whose date is admitted to be not far from 1707–1685. But 1685 is the very year secured from the Kugler data as the end of the Second Dynasty, and Kashtiliash is the second successor of Gandash whom the Ashur tablet brackets with Ea gamil. Weidner avoids these extraordinary coincidences by assuming a group Burna Buriash I, Kashtiliash II, and Agum III, dating 1537–1461 with whom to connect Ulam Buriash. Most historians will feel that, on non-astronomical grounds, the Kugler dates come nearer the other evidence.

The new tablets add here and there to our knowledge of Babylonian chronology. Between Gulkishar and Peshgaldaramash we find inserted r)i-en. For the Third Dynasty we have the order Gandash, Agum I, Kashtiliash I, Ishshi, Abirattash, Tazzigurumush, Harbi shipak, an unknown king, and then only Agum II, the son of Tazzigurumush, Kuri-

galzu I, Melishipak I, and Nazimaruttash I. The three next, Burna Buriash I, Kashtiliash II, and Agum III, seem to have their chief reason for existence in the avoidance of the Ulam Buriash synchronism. From the Amarna period, he has Kara Indash I, Kurigalzu II, Kadashman Enlil I, and Burna Buriash II. In his earlier study he could not fit his scheme into the Egyptian synchronisms, and he expressed his skepticism of the Egyptian chronology; now he has succeeded in adapting his results to the Egyptian data.

Nebuchadnezzar I is now firmly fixed as the third king of the Fourth Dynasty. It is therefore probable that his father, Ninurta nadin shum, was the second, but unfortunately only Ninurta . . . is preserved on the new as on the old list. If Nebuchadnezzar was the writer of the Ninurta tukulti Ashur letter, then his father was certainly king. We already knew that Enlil nadin apal and Marduk nadin ahe followed Nebuchadnezzar, and the reviewer had suggested (*AJSL*, XXXVI, 151 f.) that next came Ittit Marduk balatu, seemingly the son of Marduk nadin ahe, that Marduk shapik zer mati broke this line as a usurper, and that the line was restored by Adad apal iddina. As an actual fact, our chief tablet shows enough of each of the next three lines to prove that these three kings followed and in this order.

The last king of the Sixth Dynasty is shown to be Shiriqtu Shuqamuna and the fifth of the Eighth, Nabu shum ukin I. Weidner assigns Marduk zakir shum to 851-828, but he was living in 825 when he forced a very disadvantageous treaty on Shamshi Adad V. Under the reign of Sennacherib, we should restore Nergal ushezib as the son of G(a)-hul. Clay has long argued that Kandalanu was not the same as Ashur bani apal; the regular opposition of the two on these tablets proves him right.

The little book is for the close student of Assyrian history. For such, there has not appeared so fundamental a work in many a long day.

A. T. OLMSTEAD

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE HITTITE PROBLEM

There are those who insist that it is useless to try to decipher any new script until a bilingual has come to hand. The Rosetta Stone and the Rock of Behistun will be called on as witnesses to the truth of such an assertion. On the other hand, the reviewer believes that as long as there is a live student of language left there will be attempts made to decipher the undeciphered—bilingual or no bilingual. The "Hittite" hieroglyphs have had many decipherers, but probably not one out of twenty ventured to publish his results. The decipherments of Sayce, Jensen, and Thompson—to mention by name a few of those who divulged their secret—were given out before the Boghaz-keui documents became available. And now Bodley's learned librarian has tried his hand at the task.¹ Perhaps, when the riddle of the hieroglyphs is finally solved, some of his results will stand.

¹ *The Hittites* (Schweich Lectures for 1918). By A. E. Cowley. London: Oxford University Press, 1920. viii + 94 pages.